

## REMARKS

1. Claim 5 was rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for claiming embodiments of the invention that are outside the scope of base claim 1.
2. Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 5 is based on an incorrect analysis of the claim language. By the very nature of dependent claims, claim 5 inherently includes all of the limitations of claim 1, therefore it is a subset of claim 1 and the limitations recited in it further limit the scope of the invention claimed. However, in order to move this case toward allowance, claim 5 has been amended to further clarify that it is indeed a subset of claim 1 and does not claim any embodiments outside the scope of the base claim. In addition, the claim term “fibers” has been substituted with the word “filaments” to be more consistent with the patent specification. Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection of claim 5 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.
3. Examiner stated that claims 9, 10 and 22 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, base claim 1 has been amended to include all of the limitations of claim 9 and claim 9 has been canceled. Claim 10, which was dependent on claim 9, has been amended to make it dependent on claim 1. Claim 22 has been rewritten in independent form, including all of the previous limitations of base claim 1. Claims 1, 10 and 22 should now be allowable. Claims 2-8 and 11-21, being dependent upon allowable base claim 1, are also submitted as being allowable. New claims 23-26, which contain the same limitations as dependent claims 9 and 22 in combination with other features, are also submitted to be allowable.

## CONCLUSION

For all the reasons above, Applicant submits that the claims all define novel subject matter that is nonobvious. Therefore, allowance of these claims is submitted to be proper and is respectfully requested.

Applicant invites the Examiner to contact Applicant's representative as listed below for a telephonic interview if so doing would expedite the prosecution of the application.

Very respectfully submitted,

/James J. Leary/

James J. Leary  
GSS Law Group  
3900 Newpark Mall Rd  
Third Floor, Suite 317  
Newark, CA 94560

Reg. No. 35,237  
Direct Phone (636) 600-0255  
Office Phone (510) 742-7417  
Fax (510) 742-7419